

## Against the Grain

---

Volume 27 | Issue 5

Article 22

---

2015

### Alicia Wise Profile

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

(2015) "Alicia Wise Profile," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 27: Iss. 5, Article 22.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.7188>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact [epubs@purdue.edu](mailto:epubs@purdue.edu) for additional information.

## Interview — Alicia Wise from page 46

**AW:** Yes, it is all a bit confusing, but there are some basic elements of the criticism that are incorrect. Here is precisely how our policy has changed:

What's changed in Elsevier's policies?		Old policy	New policy
Immediate sharing of preprints		✓	✓
Self-archiving accepted manuscripts on a personal website or blog		✓	✓
Institutional repositories can immediately ingest accepted manuscripts		★	✓
Institutional repositories can immediately make manuscripts publicly available		★	✗
Institutions can use accepted manuscripts for internal purposes and private sharing		✓	✓
Self-archiving accepted manuscripts in a subject repository after embargo		✗	✓
Self-archiving accepted manuscripts on a commercial social sharing platform		✗	✓

**Key**

- ✓ Yes
- ★ Yes, but only if posted voluntarily
- ✗ Where we have an agreement in place
- ✗ No

We are also developing a range of services to make it easier for authors to access their accepted manuscripts, and for repositories to ingest metadata, smart links, and entitlement info for content

What's changed in our sharing and hosting policy can be accessed and downloaded online by visiting <http://www.slideshare.net/aliciawise/whats-changed-in-sharing-policy>.

To highlight a change that is of benefit to institutional repositories: all institutional repositories can now host manuscripts and use these on campus during the embargo period and publicly afterwards.

This is also a good opportunity to reiterate a message that hasn't been broadcast widely enough: we don't expect non-commercial platforms like institutional repositories to retrospectively implement these policies.

We've heard that the length of our embargo periods is a concern. Journal embargoes are neither new, nor unique, to **Elsevier**. Confusion has arisen because we didn't always enforce our embargos, preferring to work with Institutional Repositories directly to develop institution-specific agreements. Those agreements are no longer necessary; instead we are now communicating our embargoes more clearly. What is important to note is that authors may still post their manuscripts on their personal Websites, so there remains a method for immediate posting.

Our embargo periods are typically between 12 and 24 months, with some longer or shorter exceptions. We are hearing that it is the length of our embargo periods that is of concern rather than the fact of their existence. Generally embargos should be set on a title-by-title basis by publishers; however we recognize that other stakeholders seek influence over embargo lengths too, and this is reasonable. We had already been planning a review of our embargo periods in 2015. While I cannot pre-judge the outcome of this review, we are very conscious of the many new funding body policies that have emerged in the last year with 12-month embargo periods, all of which we will factor in.

More recently, we've begun to hear (from some, certainly not all) librarians that their concerns stem from a belief that scholars should be

free to share their articles in any way that they would like to and that it is no business at all of publishers. The way full-text articles are shared impacts, however, on the ability of publishers to sell subscriptions to articles the authors have chosen to publish under this business model. This is of course a deep and important strategic topic for all stakeholders to discuss, particularly with reference to subscription content, and perhaps this discussion is not most constructively done in the context of one publisher's policies.

**ATG:** In a recent interview in *Research Information*, you said that *Green OA depended on the subscription model continuing to operate. How so? What is the relationship between the two?*

**AW:** Right now there are two times in the lifecycle that payment for publishing services occurs: on the author-side OR on the reader-side. When publishers are paid on the author-side — for example through an APC for gold open access publishing, or because the publishing costs of an issue or journal are subsidized by a sponsor of some kind — then open access is easy: the final version of the article can be made freely available right away. When publishers are paid on the reader-side — for example, when an article is published under the subscription model — then open access is more challenging, and this is the case with the green model. In green open access, a version of the peer-review full-text article is made freely available, and so this needs to be done in a way that enables the subscription model to continue to operate or else the whole system just tumbles down. (I understand that some OA advocates relish the idea of the entire scholarly communication system tumbling down, but most stakeholders instead want an orderly transition to an open access world.)

**ATG:** In that same interview you said that Elsevier not only has more than 100 fully OA journals and more than 1,600 hybrid titles, you also have more than 100 OA partnerships with development partners. Can you tell us more about those partnerships? Who are these partners? What is the nature of your relationship with them?

*continued on page 50*

## against the grain people profile

### Alicia Wise

Director of Access & Policy, Elsevier

125 London Wall, London, EC2Y 5AS, United Kingdom

Phone: +44 7823536826 • <a.wise@elsevier.com>

<http://www.elsevier.com/about/open-science/open-access>

**BORN AND LIVED:** Born in Florida, have lived all over the U.S. and now in the UK.

**EARLY LIFE:** Yes, I had one.

**PROFESSIONAL CAREER AND ACTIVITIES:** Ph.D. in Anthropology/Archaeology from UNC-Chapel Hill. After leaving archaeology, I worked at the **JISC, Publishers Licensing Society, the Publishers Association**, and now **Elsevier**.

**FAMILY:** Husband and two sons and two cats, plus a ginormous extended family in Florida and Ohio.

**IN MY SPARE TIME I LIKE:** Gardening, reading, walking.

**FAVORITE BOOKS:** Right now I am binging on the *Deed of Paksenarian* trilogy by Elizabeth Moon.

**PET PEEVES:** Anti-publisher sentiment from librarians, or anti-librarian sentiment from publishers. Grrrrrrrr!

**PHILOSOPHY:** I'm not so fancy as to have a philosophy, but try very hard to listen well, be pragmatic, and work hard and in collaboration with others.

**MOST MEMORABLE CAREER ACHIEVEMENT:** Hopefully still to come in information provision. In archaeology it was perhaps discovering the northernmost amphitheatre in the Roman Empire.

**GOAL I HOPE TO ACHIEVE FIVE YEARS FROM NOW:** It would be terrific to help create a world in which any blind or dyslexic person could confidently walk into any bookshop or library (or access those services online), in confidence that they will find any book they want in a format entirely accessible to them.

**HOW/WHERE DO I SEE THE INDUSTRY IN FIVE YEARS:** Still changing very rapidly, driven by technological changes, and much more collaborative and social and open. 🐼